

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/618,088	07/14/2003	Elizabeth Jaffee	001107.00363	4098	
22907 7590 06/01/2010 EXAMINER & WITCOFF, LTD.			IINER		
1100 13th STR			GUSSOW, ANNE		
SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	.,		1643		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/01/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/618,088	JAFFEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANNE M. GUSSOW	1643	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 13 May 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. \( \text{\texitext{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text
<ul> <li>a) Metal The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> </ul>
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will be statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 705.07 THE PROPERTY OF THE FINAL REJECTION.
Extensions of time may be our fined-under 27 CFR 1.85(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.35(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been fined in the rate of the period of the perio
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filled, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or menended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>26.38.115 and 122-126</u> .
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and

- was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
- 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

- 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
- 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 4/9/10
- 13. Other: .

/Anne M. Gussow/ Examiner, Art Unit 1643 Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Applicant's arguments have overcome the objection to claim 126 regarding the Markush group.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments filed May 13, 2010 have been carefully considered by the examiner, but are deemed not to be persuasive.

Regarding the 112 indefinite rejection, the examiner agrees that dependent claims 124 and 125 require a second polypeptide, however, the independent claims, when read separate from claims 124 and 125, do not require a second polypeptide. Each claim is examined on it's merits, not a claim set as a whole. Therefore, claims 26, 38, 115, 122, 123, and 126 are indefinite for the reasons of record.

Regarding the 112 written description rejection, the specification discloses fusion peptides comprising a first peptide fused to a second peptide. The specification does not disclose compositions comprising more than one peptide. Applicant's citation of "a repeated series of an epitope sequence or different epitope sequences in a series" does not support more than one peptide - both the repeated series of a single epitope or the series of different epitopes are still a single peptide and the fusion peptide is a single peptide although it contains two parts.

Regarding the 103(a) rejection, with respect to the 'obvious to try' rationale, MPEP 2141 states exempliary rationales that may support a conclusion of obviousness include obvious to try - choosing from a finite number of identified, predictable predictable synamics, with a reasonable expectation of success. In the instant case, it was known in the art that mesothelin protein is overexpressed in a number of cancer types. Thus, treatment involving targeting the overexpressed mesothelin protein would be obvious because Argani tasch that mesothelin is a promising target for immunotherapy, for those malignancies. Since the art teaches mesothelin as a target for immunotherapy, applicant's arguments regional control in the protein sample of the protein sample and the present of the immune art, in this instance, Argani is teaching that mesothelin is a specific target for immunotherapy. Therefore, for these and the reasons of feorof, the relection is maintained.